



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXI.

BALTIMORE, NOVEMBER, 1906.

No. 7.

## THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF THE FIVE PRINTS OF THE TESTINA AND THE TERMINUS POST QUEM OF THE ORIGINAL PRINT. II.\*

### *The Time of the Original Print.*

The *terminus post quem* of No. 5 may be determined with the aid of an edition of the *Arte della Guerra* of 1587 and an edition of the *Asino d' Oro* and minor works including the *Mandragola* and *Clitia* of 1588, together with the previous editions of those works.

The editions of 1587 and 1588 belong, as was first noticed by Bongi in the article referred to above, to a group of editions which owing to the prohibition of the print and sale of the writings of Machiavelli by Paul IV in 1559 were all printed abroad in Protestant territory but all bear the name of some Italian printer and Italian city on their title pages. The edition of the *Arte* of 1587 is no exception to it, for although neither the copy used by Bongi nor that used by me in Göttingen contains the name of a printer and the place of publication, the copy in the possession of the British Museum contains both. The main title-page of the Museum copy, the communication of which I owe to the courtesy of Mr. W. R. Wilson of the Museum, reads as follows: *Libro dell' Arte | della guerra di | Nicolo Machia | velli | Cittadino et Se | cretario Fiorentino | con somma diligenza ristampati* (!) | picture of a palm tree with toads and snakes below and the inscription: *Il vostro malignare non gioua nulla*<sup>8</sup> and at the foot of the page: *In*

*Palermo appres- | so Antonello degli | Antonelli.* The indication of the year occurs on a cancel title-page which is bound up at the end of the Museum copy, but placed in front in Göttingen. It reads: *I | Sette Libri | dell' Arte della | Guerra di Nicolo | Machiavelli | Cittadino, et Se- | cretario Fiorentino. | Nouamente corretti, | & con summa diligenza ristampati.* | vacant space and at the foot of the page: MDLXXXVII. The title of the edition of 1588 runs as follows: *Lasino | d'Oro di Nicolo | Macchiavelli | con tutte laltre | sue operette. | La contenenza delle quali ha- | uerai nella seguente | facciata.* | picture which, apart from a few changes, corresponds to the lower part of the one in Giglio's editions of Machiavelli, Venice, 1554, and below: *In Roma MDLXXXVIII.* In a preface to the reader the unknown printer speaks of the death of the 'buono stampatore Antoniello de gli Antonielli di Palermo' and declares that in consequence of it he is now fulfilling the promise of the lamented printer and issuing the book which the latter had promised to the reader.

In addition to these there are editions of the *Discorsi* and of the *Prencipe* which profess to have been printed by 'gli heredi di Antoniello degli Antonielli' of Palermo as early as January, 1584—poor Antoniello therefore once died before 1584, then was resurrected to publish the *Arte* in 1587 and had died again for the second time in 1588—and an edition of the *Historie* which claims to have been issued by 'gli heredi di Gabriel Giolito de Ferrari' in Piacenza in 1587. The *Discorsi* and the *Prencipe* show on their title-pages the picture with the palm tree which we noticed in the *Arte*. The *Historie* reproduce the picture of Giolito's editions of Machiavelli, Venice, 1550, yet a reference to the inevitable Antoniello degli Antonielli in the preface to the reader classes them likewise with the other four editions described.

The real name of the man who was posing by

the preface to the *Discorsi* suggest, however, that the toads and snakes represent the impotent and venomous revilers of the author himself.

\* Cp. current volume of *Modern Language Notes*, June number, pp. 171-175, for first part of this study. The writer has extended his investigation to all editions of the *Testina* of the sixteenth century. His conclusions, here come to, have been substantiated by ample proof, and the full investigation will be printed later in book form.—A. M. E.

<sup>8</sup> Bongi, *l. c.*, p. 133, sees in this picture, which occurs likewise in the editions of the *Discorsi* and *Prencipe* of 1584, an allusion to some trouble undergone by the editor. The repeated references to the revilers of Machiavelli in

turns as the heirs of Antonello degli Antonelli and as Antonello degli Antonelli himself—the omissions of the *i* in the two names in the first title of the *Arte* must be regarded as misprints—was according to Dr. Pollard<sup>9</sup> of the British Museum John Wolfe of London, who therefore perhaps issued the *Historie* and the *Asino d' Oro* also. In the preface to the reader in the *Discorsi* he claims to have tried to get hold of the manuscript of the author but only to have succeeded in securing the editions of the Sons of Aldo of 1546 and of Giolito of 1550. In the progress of his work, however, he adhered as a matter of fact to Giolito not only in the *Discorsi* but also in the *Prencipe* and in the *Arte*. The *Historie* likewise reproduce the text of Giolito and solely the *Asino d' Oro* for lack of an edition by Giolito makes use of other sources. Neither the preface nor the text of any of these five editions betray a knowledge of the Testina, but, as we are now about to see, the Testina undoubtedly knew the editions of the *Arte* and the *Asino d' Oro* in its turn.

Testina No. 5 agrees with the *Arte* of 1587—I shall henceforth for briefness' sake simply call them T 5 and 1587—in the following points. Only in T 5 and on the cancel title-page of 1587 do we find the title: *I Sette Libri dell' Arte della Guerra*; all previous editions including the first title-page of 1587 itself bear the title *Libro dell' Arte della Guerra*. Only in T 5 and 1587 the word *significa* in the explanations of the 'Figure,' which elsewhere always stands in the top line between the sign *o* and *Fanti con lo scudo*, is written with a capital and moved half-way down the column, both the signs or letters and their explanations being provided with brackets. Only in T 5 and 1587 the squares of 'Figure' 1 and 2 are divided and distributed over two pages; in the others they are undivided and placed on one

page. Only in T 5 and 1587 'Figura' 7 gives a real picture of the camp with its rows of tents, its guns, people, horses, etc.; in the others there is a plain linear drawing without accessories of any kind. Moreover the correspondence of T 5 and 1587 in this picture of the camp extends down to the most minute detail and only a careful examination discloses some hardly perceptible differences in the height of some of the tents and in a few other matters. To this is added the agreement in a few very singular misprints not found in any other edition, though not a few errors of the press are faithfully passed on from edition to edition. In the First Book T 5, p. 33, l. 10 = 1587, c. 22 back, l. 23, *il paglargli* in place of *il pagargli*; in the Second Book T 5, p. 40, l. 33 = 1587, c. 29, l. 1, *attamentente* for *attamente*; T 5, p. 50, l. 26 = 1587, c. 36, l. 29 f., *esseritarsi* instead of *essercitarsi*; T 5, p. 60, l. 29, *confenderebbe* = 1587, c. 44, l. 20, *confederebbe* in place of *confonderebbe*. These correspondences in the title, the explanations of the 'Figure,' 'Figure' 1 and 2, and above all in the minute details of 'Figura' 7 and some such odd misprints can only be accounted for by the assumption that either 1587 is largely based upon T 5, or T 5 upon 1587.

The former possibility, *i. e.* that 1587 depends on T 5, is ruled out by the observation that 1587, as was hinted at above, rests on the edition of Giolito of 1550. Only the editions of 1587 and 1550—we take no notice of that of 1554 because it is a literal reprint of that of 1550 and cannot have served as a basis for 1587 owing to an error in a numeral<sup>10</sup> not repeated in 1587—have the following peculiarities not found in the Testina nor in any previous edition. First, in the First Book in the passage T 5, p. 22, l. 19 = 1587, c. 14 back, l. 17 f. = 1550, c. 13, l. 5 f. *non si puo chiamare deletto*; *perche deletto vuol dire etc.*, *deletto* in both cases is replaced by *sceltato*. Second, about a page from the close of the same Book *dal deletto* is replaced by *dalla scelta*. Third, in the Second Book, T 5, p. 60, l. 25 = 1587, c. 44, l. 15 = 1550, c. 35, l. 6 from below, *verbi gratia* is translated into *per cagion di essemplio*. Fourth, in the same Book T 5, p. 67, l. 22 f. = 1587, c. 49,

<sup>9</sup> There is conflict of statements as to whether Dr. Pollard holds that John Wolfe was *surely* or *probably* the printer of the *Discorsi*, *Prencipe* and *Arte*. Bongi maintains to have been informed by Dr. Pollard that J. W. was *surely* the printer of the *Discorsi* and the *Prencipe* (Bongi does not know of the first title-page of the *Arte*). On the other hand a note by Dr. Pollard attached to the entry of the volume in the Library Catalogue reads: 'Probably printed secretly at London by John Wolfe [not] (omitted by misprint) before 28 Jan. 1584.' Or does 'probably' refer to the date only?

<sup>10</sup> C. 24 back, l. 6 xxviii, in place of xviii with Giolito, likewise c. 24 back, l. 6, and *diciotto* 1587, c. 29 back, l. 24.

1. 29 f. = 1550, c. 39, l. 5 from below the words *ò per necessità* are omitted in the phrase *che habbiano fauorità (!) la virtù, ò per necessità, ò per altra humana passione*. Fifth, in 'Figura' 4 twice two *r*'s are wanting. Sixth, in 'Figura' 5 half a row of C and O is omitted. Seventh, in 'Figura' 6 the place of a Z is erroneously taken by an o. On the other hand there is neither in the system of punctuation, nor in the 'Figure,' nor in the text, as far as I have examined it, a single deviation from Giolito that is not caused either by inadvertency or by an attempt to emendate an obscure passage by conjecture instead of by reference to another edition. *E. g.* in the Second Book T 5, p. 56, l. 30 = 1587, c. 41, l. 13 = Giol., c. 33, l. 10, Giolito's *le teste si conuengono* was changed to *le teste conuengono* while a consultation of T 5 or some of the other editions would have furnished the correct reading *le teste si coniuengono*. Or take a simply hopeless passage in the same book. Giolito, c. 41 below and next page prints: *uorrei che ogni X. huomini d'arme hauessero V. carriaggi*, (and once more) *uorrei che ogni X. huomini d'arme hauessero V. carriaggi, & ogni X. cauagli leggieri* (number wanting). *Liquali*, etc., 1587, c. 52, 13 ff. puts: *vorrei che ogni dieci huomini d'arme hauessero cinque carriaggi, vorrei che ogni dieci & cauagli leggieri hauessero cinque carriaggi. Liquali*, etc. A glance at the Testina, p. 71, l. 10 ff., or any other edition would have furnished the true reading, *Vorrei che ogni dieci huomini d'arme hauessero cinque carriaggi, & ogni dieci caualli leggieri due, iguali*, etc. Since then, as was shown above, either 1587 must have known T 5, or T 5 1587, and since, as has just been seen, 1587 depends on Giolito alone and shows no indication of the consultation of another edition, there is no escape from the conclusion that T 5 knew 1587 and that the *terminus post quem* of T 5 must be transferred from 1550 to 1587.

Another question is to what extent T 5 is based upon 1587, and whether the emendations which the editor of T 5 made in the text of 1587 are all due to conjecture or partly the result of the comparison with some other edition. My present opinion is that the editor of T 5 at first prepared his text with the aid of 1587 alone, correcting evident misprints and making his emendations,

mostly correctly, but a few times, as the comparison of previous editions shows, incorrectly,<sup>11</sup> and that before going to press he had a chance to collate the edition of Comin de Trino, 1541. If he had been in possession of another edition of the *Arte* in the first place, he would never have made that of 1587 the basis of his text, because the manner in which he revolutionized the traditional punctuation of the *Arte* as well as many of his corrections and emendations tend to prove that he was doubtless a man of taste and considerable critical judgment. On the other hand it would seem to me more than doubtful that John Wolfe and his compositors had any native Italian of scholarly attainments to superintend their edition, as mistakes and misprints simply abound all the way from the first title-page to the long but far from complete list of errata, which is all the more surprising because his editions of the *Discorsi* and the *Prencipe* are not marred by many more errors than those of other publishers of writings of Machiavelli. Perhaps the very great number of misprints, of which he was at least partly conscious when he compiled his errata, together with the untimely resurrection of Antonello degli Antonelli was the reason why John Wolfe sent out not a few copies of his *Arte* with the cancel title-page only. The *Asino d'Oro*, etc., of 1588, which is now about to engage our attention, though by no means free from errors, shows upon the whole much greater care.

A critical examination of the *Novella* in the editions of 1588 and T 5 together with the original edition of 1549<sup>12</sup> shows that the edition of 1588, apart from a few peculiarities of spelling of its own, holds an intermediate position between that of 1549 and T 5. It agrees with the former above all in the entire system of punctuation save the

<sup>11</sup> *E. g.* T 5, p. 19, l. 4, *terrà* is put incorrectly in place of the *serrà* of all Venetian editions. Giunti, 1529, has *scerrà*. T 5, p. 28, 9 *Ma tornando al nostro deletto, dico*, etc., takes the place of the *Ma torniamo*, etc., of all other editions. Giunti, 1529, puts a period after *deletto*. T 5, p. 61, 14 *quando volesse* in all editions I have seen misprinted for *volessi* is changed to *volesse*.

<sup>12</sup> The title of this edition, of which only one complete copy seems now to be extant, is not given correctly by Gamba. It reads: *L'Asino d'Oro di Nicolo Machiavelli, | Con alcuni altri Cap. & Nouelle | del medesimo, | etc. | In Fiorenza MDXLIX.*

addition of numerous commas and two or three other changes. It always retains the forms *quegli*, *frategli*, *anchora*, *anchor*, *auenire*, *intra* and *gnene* (1549 *gne ne*) where T 5 puts *quelli*, *fratelli*, *ancora*, *ancor*, *auuenire*, *tra*, and *gliene*. It preserves e. g. *infra*, *cauagli*, *grande spese*, *de carnesciali*, *se a questo ne fosse* (1549 *fusse*) *nata la quiete*, *ruina*, *sanza*, *letame*, *faratti*, *mezo*, *moglieta* (1549 *mogliata*), *se la fosse* (1549 *fusse*) *d'essa* and the correct forms *trarnelo* and *sieno* which T 5 changes to *fra*, *caualli*, *grandi sp.*, *di c.*, *se da questo*, etc., *rouina*, *senza*, *lettame*, *faraiti*, *mezzo*, *moglie tua*, *che la f. d.* and the errors *trarnerlo* and *siene*, which thence were passed on to other prints and editions.

On the other hand the edition of 1588 makes the following alterations, all of which are found likewise in T 5. *Tolto moglie* and *prouato l'una* become *tolta m.* and *prouata l.* *Per celeste dispositione & fatal sorte, da l'uno & l'altro, questo uero, a tutti quegli disagi & mali* and *e sono* are enlarged to *per c. d. & per fatal sorte, da l'uno & da l'altro* (T 5 has *dall'*), *questo esser uero, a tutti quegli mali et a tutti quegli disagi* (T 5 has *quelli*), and *e (e') ci sono* and *ne ui si trouando rimedio* develops even into *ne trouandosi il rimedio de frati* (T 5 *de' F.*) *valeuole*. Other material changes are the substitution of *lo* for *il* in *per il passato, pareua* for *occorreu* in *A molti altri occorreu*, *conuentioni* for *conditioni* in *obligossi a quelle conditioni*, and the omission of *et* in *et detto questo*. *Di poi, non dimanco, arrecaua, oltra di questo, nuoua, loco, uolse*, and often *fusse* become *dopo, non di meno, recaua, oltre a. g., nouella, luogo, uolle* and *fosse*, etc.

These two groups of examples, both of which might be multiplied, admit only of one of two inferences. Either the edition of 1588 made use of that of 1549 only, making of its own accord the rather great changes which are likewise found in T 5, but retaining the spellings and expressions given in the first group and the essentials of punctuation, while T 5, resting on the edition of 1588 alone, in addition changed and modernized the spellings and expressions of the first group and recast the system of punctuation in harmony with that of the *Arte* and the other parts of the volume. Or the edition of 1588 used both the edition of 1549 and T 5, making the former its basis both in

its text and punctuation and selecting from the latter the alterations of which our second group has given the principal examples. The choice between these two alternatives cannot be doubtful. The former is simple and in perfect keeping with the practice of the time, the latter would be without a parallel. In the thirty and some cases of early prints of Machiavelli hitherto examined by me there is not a single case of such eclecticism.<sup>13</sup> In nine cases out of ten one text only was followed more or less faithfully and, if another was consulted at all, it was for passages or words that needed attention. Besides, and that is if possible of still greater moment, it is unthinkable that the edition of 1588 alone should not have availed itself of the much improved system of punctuation first introduced into the works of Machiavelli by T 5, while all other editions which are known to have appeared after the Testina had entered the race could not help falling in line and copying it for almost two centuries.

I cannot dwell here extensively on the *Mandragola* and *Clitia*, because I have not yet succeeded in discovering the editions of the two plays which were used by the publisher of 1588. I may say, however, that the circumstance that in the edition of 1588 the two comedies still retain their separate title-pages on which even the year is repeated, while in T 5 such a distinction does not exist any longer, is pointing towards the conclusion that in the edition of 1588 they were united with the *Asino d' Oro* and the other pieces of the edition of 1549 for the first time and put, as it were, like two independent little books in the same cover with them. Besides, barring the cases of misprints, the edition of 1588 evidently in some places has more original forms than T 5, and in one case in the *Mandragola* (Act v, Sc. 5) it has preserved a word secured by the edition of Venice of 1537 which has dropped out in T 5. I refer to

<sup>13</sup> Lisio, l. c., to be sure, says with regard to the proceeding of the editor of the Testina in the case of the *Principe* that his edition '*costituita sul testo bladano e giuntino, preferendo or questo or quello senz' altra ragione che un' ombra di estetica, rifà, a sua volta, liberamente le parole e le frasi al Machiavelli.*' In reality T 5 neither used Blado nor Giunti, but an edition s. l. 1535 or another print resting on the latter. The edition of 1535 itself is based upon Giunti, 1532.

*proprio* in the phrase : *perche gli è proprio stamane come se tu rinascessi*.

Since it may now be regarded as proven that the *terminus post quem* of the Testina should be advanced another year, from 1587 to 1588, an attempt must still be made to account for the reasons which may have induced the editor of T 5 to launch his volume with the false date of 1550. As was seen above, John Wolfe, or whatever other English printer may have been engaged in the issue of any of the five editions of the years 1584–1588, had considered it opportune to use names of Italian printers and cities in order to give Italian purchasers a higher opinion of the value of his texts and to induce them to brave the risks and penalties connected with the sale and even possession of forbidden books more readily. In view of this practice of others the editor of the Testina must naturally have hesitated to let his work stand on its own merits solely and hit upon the capital idea of trying to offset the Papal condemnation of 1559 by recording in front of his edition the evidence of Papal patronage granted to Blado for the print of the *Historie, Principe and Discorsi* in 1531. Both the early date of this privilege of Blado and the consideration that an earlier date would do much to enhance the reputation of his labor anyhow may then have induced him to date it back to 1550. Nor did the result disprove the correctness of his calculations, for his volume was not only reprinted a number of times, but also gained a reputation with the general reading public and scholars alike which would scarcely have been quite so great and hardly have lasted quite so long if the late date of its actual issue had been known.

While I am as yet unable to offer any suggestion with regard to a *terminus ante quem* of the original print except that I am inclined to believe that it cannot have been much later than 1581, because the later the actual date, the easier the discovery of the trick with the false one, I may say a word concerning the time of the latest prints. Upon my inquiry at the Public Library of Geneva I have learned through the kindness of its present Conservator, M. F. Gardy, that Pietro Chouet

and Pietro Aubert,<sup>14</sup> whose names are found imprinted with a handpress on the title-pages of some copies of the Testina were booksellers in Geneva during the first half of the seventeenth century and 'sauf erreur' died about 1640. Since now, as far as I am aware, their names neither occur on copies of A and B (Nos. 5 and 2) nor on any of E (No. 4) but only on some of the intermediate ones, C and in particular D (Nos. 1 and 3), it would appear that when they were doing business, A and B had been disposed of, C and D were just in the market and E had not yet been printed.

This assumption would agree quite well with another item of information which I owe to the same source to the effect that Dufour, late director of the same library and exceedingly well versed in Geneva typography, put a note in a copy of E, saying : "*Parait avoir été imprimé à Genève, mais au 17<sup>e</sup> siècle (vers 1640?)*" i. e. just after the probable date of the death of Pietro Chouet and Pietro Aubert. In addition to this it should be mentioned that the year M.DC.L occurs on the main title-page of some copies of E, M.D.C however appearing on the sub-titles as usual. While it is safe to say that the M.DC clearly betrays the true century of the printer, it might be a little rash to suppose that the following L in the same way indicates the actual year instead of being merely a repetition of the L on the subtitles. I for my part am rather in favor of accepting Dufour's opinion until invalidated by stronger evidence and regard 1640 as the probable time of the last print of the Testina.

A. GERBER.

Wiesbaden, Germany.

---

<sup>14</sup>The Strassburg copy of D (No. 3) has Pietro Alberto in place of P. Aubert, a Florentine copy Genevæ alone without either of the two names. The majority of the copies of C (No. 1) which I have seen show neither Genevæ, nor In Geneva, nor one of these two names on their title-pages.